REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated

March 29, 2004. Claims 1-19, 23-41, and 45 are presented for examination, of which

Claims 1, 23, and 45, the independent claims, have been amended to define still more

clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

A Claim To Priority and a certified copy of the priority document for this

application were filed on March 31, 2000, as evidenced by the returned receipt postcard

bearing the stamp of the Patent and Trademark Office, a copy of which is attached hereto.

Applicants again respectfully request acknowledgment of the claim for foreign priority and

the receipt of the certified copy.

Claims 1, 12-19, 23, 34-41, and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,884,249 (*Namba et al.*), and Claims 2-11 and 24-

33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Namba et al.* in view

of U.S. Patent No. 6,292,767 (*Jackson et al.*).

As shown above, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 23, and

45 in terms that more clearly define what they regard as their invention. Applicants submit

that these amended independent claims, together with the remaining claims dependent

thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 1 is an information

processing apparatus. The apparatus includes a plurality of input means which input

different types of information, and storage means which stores information input from each

of the plurality of input means with an input time thereof. The apparatus also includes

sorting means which sorts at least two types of information stored in the storage means in

12

in an order in accordance with the input time, and input analyzing means which analyzes a sequence of the at least two types of information sorted in the input time order by the sorting means.

Among other important features of Claim 1 are storing the information input from each of the plurality of input means with an input time thereof, sorting at least two types of information stored in the storage means in an order in accordance with the input time, and analyzing a sequence of the at least two types of information sorted in the input time order by the sorting means.

Namba et al. relates to an input managing method when simultaneously using plural input means in information processing equipment. *Namba et al.* discusses receiving a plurality of information inputted from a speech recognition unit 1, a touch panel unit 2, and a keyboard 3, collecting and analyzing the plurality of information whose estimated input times are close to one another (column 2, lines 10-32, and column 6, lines 51-58). However, nothing has been found in *Namba et al.* that would teach or suggest storing the information input from each of the plurality of input means with an input time thereof, sorting at least two types of information stored in the storage means in an order in accordance with the input time, and analyzing a sequence of the at least two types of information sorted in the input time order by the sorting means, as recited in Claim 1.

The Office Action appears to equate the recognition result selecting section 4 and the semantic analyzing section 5 of *Namba et al.* with the sorting and input analyzing means of Claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree with this. The recognition result selecting section merely manages a pair of the recognition result and time stamp from the inputting means group 121, collects the pairs into groups (semantic analysis unit) and then

13

reports each group to the semantic analyzing section 5 (column 8, lines 38-45). The

recognition result selecting unit 4 also groups a set of certain recognition results with the

same time when a time stamp for each of the recognition results cannot be obtained

(column 7, lines 19-22). The semantic analyzing section 5 accepts the semantic analysis

unit and analyzes the semantics according to information held in instruction information

table 10 (column 8, lines 61-65). However, as stated previously, nothing has been found in

Namba et al. that would teach or suggest storing the information input from each of the

plurality of input means with an input time thereof, sorting at least two types of

information stored in the storage means <u>in an order in accordance with the input time</u>, and

analyzing a sequence of the at least two types of information sorted <u>in the input time order</u>

<u>by the sorting means,</u> as recited in Claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is clearly

patentable over *Namba et al.*

Independent Claims 23 and 45 are method and computer-readable storage

medium claims, respectively, corresponding to apparatus Claim 1, and are believed to be

patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in

Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as

references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed

patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another

of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the

same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of

the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and, therefore, its entry is believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment After Final Action, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. _29,296_

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NYMAIN436694

15